

**FLOOD CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES
September 15, 2004**

Melvin Martin, Chairman called the meeting of the Flood Control Advisory Board (FCAB) to order at 2:25 p.m. on Wednesday, September 15, 2004.

Board Members Present: Melvin Martin, Chairman; Scott Ward, Vice-Chairman; Kent Cooper, Secretary, Thomas Callow, Ex Officio;

Board Members Absent: Paul Cherrington, Ex Officio; DeWayne Justice; Hermant Patel:

Staff Members Present: Julie Lemmon, General Counsel; Dick Perreault, CIP/Policy Manager; Tim Phillips, Acting Chief Engineer & General Manager; Russ Miracle, Division Manager, Planning and Project Management; Scott Vogel, Project Manager; Felicia Terry, Regional Area Planning Manager; Tom Loomis, Engineering Special Projects Manager; Afshin Ahouraiyan, Project Manager; Brett Howey, Dam Safety Engineer; Raju Shah; Greg Jones, Project Manager; Mike Wilson, Division Manager, Lands and Right-of-Way; Tom Renckly, Structures Management Branch Manager; Robert Knighton; Emili Kolevski, Project Manager; Cindy Overton; Linda Reinbold; Mike Greenslade; and BJ Johnston, Clerk of the Flood Control Advisory Board.

Guests Present: Ed Fritz, MCDOT; Joe Bergquist, Stantec; Terri George, DEA; Michael Zigler, City of Phoenix; William Puffer, Spookhill NAA; Tim Montgomery, HDR.

1) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF AUGUST 25, 2004.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Ward to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

2) DESIGN OF THE MCDOWELL ROAD AND HERMOSA VISTA DR. – HAWES ROAD DRAINAGE SYSTEM IGA FCD2004A002

This is an IGA between the District and the City of Mesa for the design of the McDowell Road and Hermosa Vista Dr. – Hawes Road Drainage System elements of the Spook Hill Area Drainage Master Plan. Afshin Ahouraiyan, Project Manager, made this presentation.

Cooper: The design costs are about \$1 million. What is the rough estimate of the total construction cost?

Ahouraiyan: If I remember correctly, the entire cost for design and construction was estimated at \$3 million, \$1 million for the design and about \$2 million for construction and construction management.

Cooper: Of course, that raises the question, why is one third of our cost on design? We have a \$3 million dollar value, \$2 million dollars worth of construction and \$1 million for the design; I have a problem with that.

Ahouraiyan: There is a bit of an issue that we are facing with the plan as it was approved. We lost one of our detention basin sites to development. So we did a rough estimate of the cost of coming up with another location that would be suitable. Therefore, the plan for this specific element is not to the 15% design element levels that we had for the entire plan. That is why the cost of the design is a little higher than what it would normally be, to cover some of the unknowns.

Puffer: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, my name is William Puffer. I live at 8330 E. Thomas Road, Mesa, AZ, which is north of the area in question. It doesn't protect me, however, I am the president of the Spook Hill Neighborhood Action Association. This group represents the neighbors mainly in the County and about 9 square miles of this area. I also was the chairman of the Citizens Committee that was formed for the ADMP. That committee, if you remember, was formed after the original plans by the Flood Control District met with some pretty strong opposition. So the City and the Board formed this advisory board. The plan that is being implemented now is the plan that this board recommended. We worked pretty hard on that plan. We met numerous times over a 9-month period. We started with 13 different options that we narrowed those down to 4. We held 2 public meetings and narrowed it down to this recommendation. The Mesa City Counsel and the Board of Supervisors have approved this recommendation. Our concerns really only increase as the development increases. The film that was taken (showing flooding during a rain storm) was prior to some of the development that is there now. As we get more rooftops and more hard surface roads, the PM-10 program is going through this area now, we can only expect more run off. And we haven't had a significant storm here in the last 10 years; this was a very minor storm. The area that is being protected we support because it is where we have the biggest problems. Culver St and Hermosa Vista and the areas immediately around them, actually act as drainage channels. Every time we get a decent rain, Culver St. has to have fill brought in because it washes right down to the rock base. Now, it's been PM-10'd recently so we don't know how it will act in a storm, but it will probably create different run off problems than we have had before. In summary, we feel that this is an urgent need for our group; we know that it will take a long time to implement; we would like to see it get started. We see this as the first approach to the physical part of this process. We feel that the sharing, while it may be different than the norm, is appropriate for this need. There is very little of this part of the project that is in the city. Again we would urge you to proceed with this project.

Ward: This is an area that I know pretty well. I've known Mr. Puffer for several years. I've developed two projects in this area and everything he says is accurate. They have a very seasoned, very knowledgeable neighborhood group, who are very aware of flood conditions in that area. There has been a

lot of lot splitting done in that area without flood protection. I am glad to see that the neighbors have agreed to a plan. I will support this project.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Ward to approve the resolution as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

3) CITY OF PHOENIX DAM SAFETY PROGRAM PLANNING, RESOLUTION FCD2004R008.

Brett Howey, P.E. Dam Safety Engineer, presented this resolution with authorizes the District to negotiate and prepare intergovernmental agreements with the City of Phoenix for cost sharing, engineering assessments, inventory identification and to provide technical guidance and recommendation in the development of the City of Phoenix Dam Safety Program and Emergency Action plan.

Discussion:

Ward: Are you familiar with the Pointe Golf Course up in this area?

Howey: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ward, I am familiar with the golf course. As I understand it, the location of the golf course is not necessarily in the location of where the jurisdictional structures are. However, there may be one of these uninventoried structures that may be part of that course. A part of this inventory would be to look at structures such as that.

Ward: That was my question. I'm glad you have looked at the golf course to see if it has retention or detention possibilities.

Callow: I think the first hole is built in a detention and they have a revocable permit from City. There is a dam between the 15th and 16th holes.

Martin: Across the street?

Callow: It would be on the south side of Thunderbird.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Ward to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

4) SONOQUI WASH CHANNELIZATION – QUEEN CREEK WASH TO CHANDLER HEIGHTS ROAD.

Raju Shah, P.E. presented this item for information and discussion purposes only. No action is required.

Cooper: I wonder about the private access that we are building for people. That seems to be extraordinary lengths to go to. Do they currently have access that they want to preserve or is this system amenitive? How expensive are those access points?

Shah: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, the access is going to be at the 3:1 and 4:1 slope. These properties already back into the wash, all they have is a

gate, they open the gate and go down the slope and they are on the channel bottom.

Callow: We're talking about horses and things like that, right?

Shah: Yes. It's not building ramps to give them access to the bottom.

Cooper: That sounds better.

Wojakiewicz: My name is Andrew Wojakiewicz; I work at MCDOT as a bridge engineer. I would like to say that at this very moment, we are developing the plans for a bridge at Chandler Heights over Sonoqui Wash. We are at 40% of the final design, which is not yet scheduled for construction. I think it would be good to complete the bridge construction before beginning the channel improvements.

Shah: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, we are coordinating with MCDOT on the bridge design. For the purposes of this presentation, I did not include all the ongoing surrounding projects taking place with MCDOT, Town of Gilbert and Town of Queen Creek. However, we are coordinating with MCDOT on that bridge design. The design for the bridge was scheduled to complete the DCR last month and they are moving forward with the design. However, they do not have funding available in their 5-year budget to construct the bridge. We are working with the Town of Queen Creek to incorporate the bridge design with our project. However, the bridge design will be a separate project and MCDOT will be taking the lead on construction.

5) LOOP 303 CORRIDOR/WHITE TANKS AREA DRAINAGE MASTER PLAN UPDATE (LOOP 303 ADMP UPDATE)

Greg Jones, P.E. Project Manager, presented this item for informational purposes only. No action was required.

Callow: Greg, what happens if Proposition 400 passes and funding for the 303 then turns over to a state project? How does that affect our plans?

Jones: Actually, MCDOT has been working very closely with ADOT. They have been attending the ADOT meetings. The Federal Highway Administration has also been attending these meetings. We foresee that if we actually do go forward with the 303 project, our project partner will not be MCDOT it will be ADOT. So we are talking with them to see if we can move forward. Probably the biggest issue up here is advance land acquisition. If we don't acquire it, we are going to lose the opportunity, especially on the basin sites and some of the channel sites.

Ward: You hit the nail on the head. We need to get out there and buy those basins because that land is going up in value daily.

Jones: I'll see if I can't bring a resolution back for that.

Martin: I think this board would encourage you to do that as soon as possible. I have a feeling that the board feels that this needs to be done. We all know that real estate is going crazy, especially in that area.

6) COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF ENGINEER AND GENERAL MANAGER

Phillips: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, there are a couple of items I would like to talk to about. First, Afshin has further explained his \$3 million construction costs for the McDowell/ Hermosa Vista project. It is actually \$8.7 million for a total project cost of \$10.8 million, with the land acquisition. So the design cost is actually closer to 10% of the project costs, than the 33% cited earlier.

Next, I would like to express my appreciation for your endorsement last month for my future here at the District. The resolution is stuck somewhere in the County system, I don't know when it is going to make it to the Board of Directors. However, I do appreciate your endorsement.

The third thing I'd like to talk about is Public Works. Mr. Chairman, I understand that you had a question about what happens with Public Works and how it affects the District. So, let me give you a little overview of where we've been and what we've done. Fundamentally, there are two legal provisions with Public Works as it was developed that had to be maintained. One, our finances had to be kept separate and two, our records have to be kept separate. The structure does not really reflect that. Fundamentally, the Public Works structure provides an oversight function of the District, MCDOT and Solid Waste, and doesn't really change how we do business. What it does is maintain a consistency across the three agencies, so that when we do human resource actions, finance actions in our relationship with the county that we are consistent. When we do Article 5 contracts, there is consistency with how we do business versus how MCDOT has done business. The structure itself has Joy Rich as Chief Office, Mike Ellegood as Public Works Director, and there will be a group of employees who will report to Mike. There is the Minority Business program, Article 5, Solid Waste, MCDOT, the District and Public Works Administration. Donna Brown was just hired as the Public Works Human Resources Manager, who has an indirect supervisory responsibility for the HR functions. Sue Johnson, the District HR Manager will still report to me and I have direct supervision over her. There will be similar relationships with Finance, IT, Organizational Development and Article 3, where I will maintain direct supervision and Public Works will have an oversight role for consistency. As you know, the Lands and Right-of-Way Division has really been a little bit of MCDOT and a little bit of us with Mike Wilson, as a District employee, overseeing both organizations. In this scenario, essentially they will become part of Public Works supporting both Transportation and Flood Control. So, that is probably the biggest effect in relation to direct control. The message I'd like to convey regarding the Public Works organization is that it really does not affect us. There are two positions that will be eliminated, one by attrition that is the Deputy. The second is in the IT division; we have a bit of redundancy there, so a position will potentially be eliminated there. There are 2 IT positions that will go to Regulatory Division and one other position that will be downgraded. Some of the cost savings

that were originally projected will come from the elimination of these positions, but it is very minimal.

The other organizational change I wanted to discuss has to do with our Title 11 responsibilities, the Drainage Administration functions that we have performed for the County for the last 20 years. As you may be aware, over the last couple years there has been a lot of discussion on who should do the Title 11 function. Four or five months ago, Joy Rich led us in the direction that for the benefit of customer service and the one stop shop downtown, the Drainage Administration function should probably fall back to the County. It is fundamentally a County function; we have just performed that function under contract for them. So that function, as the result of a Board of Supervisors action, will return to the County. The effective date of the transfer will be November 8, 2004. The internal effect to us is that there will be 15 of our Drainage Administration employees who are part of our Regulatory Division will move over to Planning and Development. Basically, they will be doing the same functions they were doing here; only they will be doing them for the County. The other thing this does for us, because not all the Drainage Administration functions went with this change is allow us to plus up our Floodplain Management, which is one of our Title 48 core functions. In the past, we had shared resources between drainage and floodplain administration, now we will have dedicated individuals assigned to perform those functions for Floodplain Management. I hate to lose the employees who we have had dedicated to doing these functions. However, from a customer service standpoint, the benefit will be to be able to go into the one stop shop downtown, and receive all the aspects of getting a building permit at one place.

Those are the big organizational changes that we have had in the last couple of months.

Martin: Tim, one of the reasons that I brought that up was that under the legislation that created the Flood Control District and the funding, it has very strict regulations on the money. I questioned this because I wanted to make sure that we did not have a conflict with the money situation.

Phillips: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, this model does not direct us toward the Pima County model or the Orange County model where it is a little hard to tell where the money is going. Fundamental to the new structure is that the revenue generated from the tax dollars for flood control purposes actually go toward flood control purposes, as they have historically.

Martin: That was a concern the Board had.

7) OTHER BUSINESS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10pm